Lonie B. Bishop.
July 28-1893.

New Haven, July 28.

My dear Mr. Brewster:—

Very many thanks for your kindness in identifying my Irish Wren, which reached me safely today.

I expected it would prove C. palustris, but think it strange a breeding bird should be in such dull plumage.

I noticed no signs of moult while stuffing it, and both testes were fully developed.

spot which differs attractively in no way from the surrounding country. Shall watch for their fate next summer to learn if they return to the same place.

We probably be able to let you have their third set — or the first one you prefer — in exchange if you would like it, but not at present, as it might interest some of the members to see the three sets together at the next A.O.U. meeting.

Thanking you again for your kindness

Sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop.

Today I took my third set of from which eggs within eight feet of where I found the first. The nest was 9 feet in that of former nesting for July 11.

Finally succeeded in seeing the bird, though only for an instant, clinging to the side of the nest, and at the C. Palmetto's by once closer.

Have not been particularly interesting to see or hearing that the dog-killing Marsh Hawk, has a little as many other birds, has a strong affection for some special

If you to write me any instance of albinistic eggs which have fallen under your personal observation.

From what I can learn such eggs seem to be most frequent in species building covered nests, and that through the inheritance of this individual peculiarity birds nesting protectively in their bay white eggs in that I believe, and hope to be able to show in a book further on.

I only ask of you the reason of these in which you remove albinistic eggs to occur,

77 Whitney Avenue.
New Haven. Conn.

My dear Mr. Brewster: –

I am attempting to answer Dr. Allen's criticism to my remarks on the white eggs of Cistothorus stellaris in the January 'Auk', and to do this with to learn among what species of North American birds albinistic eggs have been found.

I have so far found very little in ornithological literature on the subject, and would be

and hear frequently to each. We can discuss attempts & bring this subject up, and you see what information you may happen to learn at hand on this subject.

Trusting this will not be too great an imposition on your kindness,

Very sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop

February 7. 1894.

Louis B. Bishop
Feby 7-1894

B. Bishop.
Feby 16-1894.

77 Whitney Avenue.
New Haven Conn.

Dear Mr Brewster:-

Many thanks for your nice note of yesterday.

Your answer was just what I wished, as I can look up the literature of the subject myself.

Having just finished looking through nine volumes of the Ornithologist & Oologist - fairly carefully. I find albinistic eggs recorded in twenty-six instances - omitting the Raptores.

Of these seven were Bluebirds, one for Long Island Branch Warbler - all represented birds.

In only one other species do I find albinistic eggs twice recorded: the Kingbird, and in most instances only a single egg was of the albino type.

I think I am on the track of an explanation of white eggs in general - omitting the Pigeons & Humming-birds, but

perhaps it will call from an equal future.

As to the other criticisms my view is publicity I wish to defence myself if possible.

Wishing you a most successful trip to Trinidad,

Very sincerely yours

Frank B. Wilder

February 12 - 1894

P.S. Shall not attempt to have anything printed until I have submitted my conclusions to competent authority.

Bishop L. B.
Dec. 4th 1896

received heartily from the Doctor & Wife. Probably Mr. Ridgway is coming to your office, as I think Mr. Albertson follows him fairly closely.

Thanking you again for your kindness to the A. C. U.

Congress,

Very sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop

77 Whitney Avenue.

New Haven, Dec. 4, 1896.

My dear Mr. Brewster —

Many many thanks for your kindness in identifying the skins I left with you: I was not in the slightest hurry for them. They all arrived in good order.

I know that when you describe T. v. cuniculorum you had not adults, but thought some might have

I was inclined to consider my fish, winter bird as a straggler from the West, and consequently a cubitoides, while the two darker, juvenile, early fall specimen — probably second year birds — I placed under luxloviciarum. I notice Ottomar Stone gives the latter — following the old Check-List — from Newfoundy, while H. C. Oberholser, in his "List of the Birds of Wayne Co., Ohio," calls the form there a cubitoides.

Such points are, I suppose, really a matter of choice, as it is impossible to tell absolutely on mere appearance since then. I am under the impression that it is a bird of Canadian wide I have seen a few ago — I forget in this publication it appeared — cumulomotum was given as the form occurring there. I have not interested the matching on the wings as marked birds, nor have not examined a large series.

The origin of the keeper name for an owl Quantity and Phillips has always been of interest to me, though I am not known much as the ornithologist,

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
77 WHITNEY AVENUE.

New Haven, Conn., March 28, 1901.

My dear Mr. Brewster —

May I ask you to identify the Clapper Rails which I am sending you with this? I would have written before sending them, but Mr. Allen tells me you will go to Washington early in April, so I thought it would probably be more convenient for you to see them at once.

Pea Island, where I collected them, is about thirty miles north of Hatteras.

I am inclined to call Nos. 5512 & 5558 your R. c. waynei, and the other one marsh this than R. crepitans, but I have seen no identified specimens of the former. The affinities of the birds of Pea Is. are northern.

Hoping I am not asking too much of your kindness. Very sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop

Bishop, L. B.
Mar. 28, 1901

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 Orange Street.

New Haven, Conn., May 24, 1902.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

This afternoon I have sent you 7 Conn., Long-billed Marsh Wrens, but am afraid only one of them will be of much use to you, as only one was taken in the breeding season. That bird was almost certainly one of the parents of that set of which eggs I gave you some years ago, and it seems to show clearly in the breast a tendency toward Mariana Wren.

The May birds were taken on the breeding-grounds, and probably would have bred here, but of course I can not be certain.

My collection is woefully deficient in breeding birds of all species from Conn. Time and again I have started to fill some vacancies, but when I reached the fields the proofs were so positive that each bird had eggs or young

under the care, that my courage failed, and I returned home empty-handed.

I have sent you also 8 long-bills & Mr. Warren from North Carolina, 7 of them certainly breeding birds, which you may like to see if you are studying this species from all parts of the country.

The plumage of these birds seems somewhat lighter than in Conn. specimens.

I have a specimen of Worthington's Warbler taken at Tarpon Springs, Fla., on March 1, and Bachman's Warbler from Tarpon Springs in Feb. & April, and Pea Island, North Carolina, taken in Feb. & May.

I would gladly send you any or all of them if they will be of the slightest service to you.

One, April, Tarpon Springs bird was labelled "jun." by the collector, and I think he is right.

How about Howe. I enclose you the two letters I have from him with statements of the size of his collection.

After the first letter I congratulated him on the knowledge he must possess of the habits of our birds if he collected the "seven or eight thousand" himself, which will explain what he says in the second letter.

I am glad to know what figures he has given you for his collection. They are much nearer what I thought probable than those in his letter. Doubtless he meant to write "hundreds" instead of "thousands" in his letter to me, but his pen slipped!

Very sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop

Bishop — Louis B. M.D.
May 24, 1902.

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

New Haven, Conn., Oct. 3. 1902.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

Thank you very much for the copy of your book entitled "Birds of the Cape Region of Lower California".

I have not yet had opportunity to read it, but I am already finding it very useful in connection with some work I am doing on the ranges of the Limicolae and Anatidae.

Very sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop

P.S. In North Dakota last June I found a pair of melanistic Ferruginous (?) Rough-legs, and secured the ♀ male and four young. Raised the young, which feathered out as black as the adults. Then killed two and intend to keep the other two till next summer. It looks as if I had a species as good as the Gyrfalcons.

Bishop Louis B. M.D.
Oct. 3, 1902

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

New Haven, Conn., Dec. 10, 1902.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

Many thanks for your interesting letter of the fifth and also for the seven skins of T. m. fragari. The latter I shall return when I post this. The mate of one of them was injured when it reached me: I trust it was so when it was sent.

All yesterday afternoon and most of this I have spent in a study of my yellow-legs in connection with yours, and have arrived both days at practically the same ~~the~~ conclusion — that it is a complete agreement with your view. I think fragari must be accepted as a valid race. The light brick are not characteristic of age. Only one of yours — No. 17865 — (the type)

of both have much longer bills. I agree entirely with Howe on the subject.

But I have not a single eastern bird that reaches in brightness of coloring, and extent of the colours below any Dakota bird.

Now a word about Sphyrapicus ruchalmeta, and I won't detain you any longer.

Is it not possible that the bird from S. California of whose subspecific identity you were uncertain were quite young?

I have found that the young of S. r. nuchalis in North Dakota are very slow in attaining the full length of bill.

Of course you have seen more of these birds than I, but I refer almost all New England Hillets taken in late summer or fall to nuchalis. Certainly the few Hillet that had in New England cannot be the parents of these birds, and their measurements place them with the western bird.

Thanking you again for your kindness in sending the skins, I am sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop

P.S. I saw today about 50 Black Ducks, - all the Red-legged - shot during the past week by Mr. Sanford at the Long Point Club on the North shore of Lake Erie. The majority were ♀♀ with red bright red legs and yellowish bills. I suspected all the late birds from that region were this form, and was glad to learn I was right.

Dec. 15.

Just until today did I find time to pack up your Yellow-legs. I send them with this; thanking you again for the privilege of seeing them

Yours

Rockford, Ill.
Dec. 10, 1902.

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

New Haven, Conn., March 29, 1903.

Dear Mr. Bange —

Many thanks for your letter of yesterday. Probably you explanation of the non-arrival of my lumber in the true one, and though I hate to lose the lumber, I should much more dislike to believe Eastgate dishonest. He is careless I know, and only of semi-medically energetic, but he is a capital assistant on a camping and collecting trip, and I have greatly enjoyed both summers with him.

He esteems highly both your brother and Mr. Carter, and if gratitude for all they have done for him cannot stimulate him to get you the mammals you want I fear he is hopeless.

Very sincerely yours
Louis B. Bishop

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

New Haven, Conn., Aug. 20. 1906.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

On my return from Saskatchewan about a week ago I was greatly pleased to find the copy of your "Birds of the Cambridge Region," which you so kindly sent me, and since then I have spent many most enjoyable hours in reading it all through from cover to cover. For it is delightful reading from beginning to end, and you are to be envied as much for your grace of diction as your ornithologic knowledge. To make a "Local List" "literature" is almost if not quite unique.

I want to thank you also for using capitals for the English names of birds. The tendency to omit them seems to

have become so strong in some quarters that I began to fear it would win. I like also your plan of putting "W.R." after a summer resident to show it sometimes occurs in winter, and I agree most heartily with what you say about the necessity of shooting to establish records unless made by a careful observer, who (1) knows the bird well in the hand, (2) knows well all the birds of the region where he is reporting it, (3) has handled the bird in the flesh, and (4) sees it under conditions in which its characteristic markings are evident.

That the appearance for years and then disappearance of species from a locality is in the nature of an overflow from their natural habitat I also thoroughly believe. In 1901 I formed black circles to Lark Bunting common in summer in the Charles Lake

region of South Dakota, where Eastgate, who has hitherto there for years, has found them only rarely. That year the conditions there were favorable for their breeding, and the Lark Bunting, I know, raised young; but elsewhere to the southwest were afflicted by weeks of severe cloudy weather during the breeding-season. In 1902 I saw almost none of either species in the same part of South Dakota, and none at all in 1903, and Eastgate assures me he has not found them in the intervening years.

I was very glad also to see that you believe in the migration of Barred and Long-eared Owls, Hairy & Red-headed Woodpeckers, Flicker, Blue Jays, Crows, Chickadees and White-throated Sparrows, for I have been confident for some years that such movements occurred, but have had ornithologists doubt the accuracy of my observations.

either Squirrels or Tree of New Haven or Cambridge are that birds are as likely to be plenty during severe or mild winters, and that in spring at least most of the warblers are represented by rather small numbers. But I am surprised to find a number of species have been found wintering at Cambridge that seem never to do so here, and also to notice that, I think, for a many you have earlier in spring and later records in fall than any I have for New Haven.

The incursion of Red-headed Woodpeckers in the fall of 1884 was duplicated here, and many remained through 1885. Now I find it only as a migrant accompanying the fall flights of Flickers.

Why Red polls should occur with you fairly frequently,

while I have looked for it here twenty-five winters in vain is as hard to explain as that Bickwell's Church should be commoner with you than the Gray-chapel, and very much nearer here.

But if some thing were known there would be little to interest one in life, so let us be thankful there are some problems left.

I think the Litchfield record you quote for the Evening Grosbeaks is wrong. I have investigated it as carefully as I could, and feel convinced that whatever the strange birds may have been they were not Evening Grosbeaks.

But I have already taken too much of your time, and all else I will say is to thank you most heartily for your admirable book.

Very sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

New Haven, Conn., Aug. 27, 1906.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

I was greatly interested in reading of the remarkable "records" that have sprung into existence since your book appeared.

I see no safe plan except to disregard all "records" unaccompanied by claims, written made by one known to be a thoroughly competent and careful observer. This will no doubt make me unpopular in certain quarters, but will make "lists" much more valuable.

Regarding the Litchfield "record" of Evening Grosbeaks I enclose with this all the correspondence I had on the subject, and you will note the Rev. Hotchkiss avoided any questions as to what

I shall insert T. ou. pragani in a foot-note.

Now a few words on the other sparrow which you mention. Ammodramus occidentalis as far as my experience goes seems to be chiefly confined to the sea-coast, at least east of the Rocky Mts. I have never succeeded in getting a specimen from North Dakota, although I have taken it in Massachusetts, Conn., North Carolina & Florida.

I doubt whether most of the birds called M. caudacutus from the Atlantic coast really belong to this form, for I question whether young can be separated in fall. I have now 12 adult skins of this bird from North Dakota taken either in spring or summer, and 40 spring birds of M. princeps from North Carolina, the latter selected from several hundred in the flesh. I have never yet had the time to measure these birds, but on comparison the difference in length of bill is very slight, if it exists at all. Although, as of course you know, the females

My two full-plumaged birds from North Dakota seem to represent the nuptial plumage, having more white on upper parts, and the dark markings on the lower parts extending farther over the abdomen than in melanoleucus from the Atlantic coast in full nuptial dress, and also have dark dots on the white chin, – only rare in typical melanoleucus. The bills of these birds seem slightly longer also. You noticed difference in these birds also.

My third N.D. bird, moulting into nuptial dress, seems to be an intermediate and is matched by three birds from Iowa, and one from Monmouth in my collection.

My ~~white~~ fall Massachusetts bird juggled me a year ago, when I was looking over my Greater Yellowlegs, and now I have you to thank for settling their relationship.

The proof of the book I have been writing with Sanford on the Cuculidae, Leptosomidae and Rallidae has just come, and

seems to me to be an adult, the other showing traces of the juvenal plumage in the lesser primary coverts. Besides my lighter birds I have from New England dark birds old and young, in summer and juvenal plumage, passing from these plumages into winter, and in the young - No. 6465, which you noticed, - complete winter plumage. The plumages of all these birds are homologous and not to be confounded with fragari. Of the latter I have another young bird fairly characteristic taken at about the same time as the other, (you may have noticed all my Harmony fragari were taken in Sept. '94, and one adult moulting into winter plumage, which I took in Harmony in '92. The white edgings to the new feathers on the back of this bird are not as broad as in typical fragari, but the general color is almost as pale.

Can I get shells loaded with the larger size of shot in Charleston? and how small can we get? No. 10?.

Cotton, and one exception I suppose I can get all of I want in Charleston.

Will it be necessary to get a license to collect birds? and, if so, how do I go to work? I am out of the Audubon Society, and have Col Pearson and some of the others see fearfully blamely what I think of them, so they are likely to cause me trouble if they get the chance. Whether they know I am coming to you I am not aware.

Now everything is frozen up again, but I trust it is growing warmer with you.

Very truly yours

Louis B. Bishop

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

Sent mem. Lab. G. F. W.
To Butterworth, very
important, as July 3rd

New Haven, Conn., June 21, 1912.

Dear Mr. Brewster—

Just before starting for Labrador Bert wrote me to be sure that Fleming and Wagner were nominated for A. A. U. Fellows. Six weeks in the field with Wagner showed me his humanitarian, but also convinced me he ought to be a Fellow — the more so as he cannot frequently attend. But as his chief sponsor you ought, it seems to me, to decide regarding his nomination. I shall be glad to second.

I fear, however, that neither he nor Fleming stand much chance of an election, as the opposition seems very strong.

Very truly yours
Louis B. Bishop

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 Orange Street.

New Haven, Conn., July 4, 1912.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

I delayed answering your letter of June 26 until I should learn what Wagner decided, and have today received yours of yesterday.

I have written Mr. Allen that you and I have recommended Wagner and should like his name if he feels so inclined. Then I will send him the blank. This is to obviate any danger of the blank being lost or mislaid.

That Wagner has little or no chance of election I agree with you, but he deserves it, and is so exceedingly anxious to become a Fellow that I am glad to give him what help I can.

thought and I have decided not to nominate Fleming this year, as there seems no present possibility of his election, and the struggle over him might so embitter the opposition as to hurt his chances later.

And this brings me to the "list of suggested candidates," as the election of certain backing runners seems to me fraught with danger to the stand of the A.C.U. regarding freedom of collecting. Fabricius book on economic ornithology I think the best that has appeared, and should favor his election but for the fact that he is bound so strongly with Conservationism politics. ~~It~~ In his report in Birds-Zoo (Nov.-Dec. last, I believe) he said the new Conn. law was in the line of advanced thought. It allows only

fair of a species to be collected in any one locality or any other restriction year, was pushed through in my absence by the Comm. Audubon Society, and was almost admittedly aimed at me. Mr. Knight made in his report of the Comm. Soc. in the same number of Bird-Lore some statements regarding Comm. collectors that seemed to me outrageous, and the Executive of the Nat. Cond. Soc. refused to take any action in the matter. So I resigned from the Nat. Cond. Soc.

As long as Faburch depends largely for his support on a society that is inimical to collecting I feel he is not fit to be a Fellow.

The other man is Fuerter. I like the latter exceedingly, and think he is one of the most charming fellows I ever met, and believe he is a

good ornithologist. His pictures, I confess, I do not think equal to some of Allan Brooks. But I do not think he ought to be elected a Fellow until he has done as good scientific work as others on the list. That Chapman will use his influence and that of the Audubon Society for them seems I take for granted. I like both, and do not wish to vote against either, but it seems to me neither should come in at present.

On the other hand Barbe has more votes than any one else on the list, and really ought to be elected, but he was not nominated ~~this~~ last year, and may not be this: at least I do not know of any one who is backing him.

How you feel in this matter of course I do not know, but if you approve I will either go to see Bebe in New York, or communicate with him, and learn whether he is to be nominated by any one.

Then, too, something ought to be done regarding nomination & the class of members, that we may not be in the same unfortunate position as last year.

Any names you may select for nomination to this class I shall be glad to second, and will send the list to Knight or I can get their signatures. I am not anxious to do this. I only want it certain that some one be renominated.

Very sincerely yours
Louis B. Bishop

P.S. I enclose a copy of the new Com. law, which please return.

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

New Haven, Conn., July 9, 1912.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

Your interesting letter of July 5 came yesterday, and I thank you for the full expression of your views regarding Josselyn "Fellows".

The three nominations for membership I have signed, and return with them, that you may send them to whom you wish. Dr. Phillips certainly should be made a member. I have followed his papers in the Auk with much interest, and have noticed that he has an unusually wide knowledge for an American ornithologist. And the same is true of Kennard. He certainly is greatly interested in ornithology, and attends the Union meetings faithfully.

Regarding Mr. Wright I have had many doubts. I read his "Birds of the Boston Public Garden" with interest, amusement and skepticism; and the latter was increased when I heard he did not collect. I have made so many mistakes in the field myself that I no longer have much confidence in unvouched records of any one or any one else unless the birds in short, unless, possibly, when the observer has had great experience both in the field and in studying skins.

Only this spring I shot both a Red-eyed Vireo and a female Scarlet Tanager because after studying them for some time through glasses I became convinced they were not those species whatever else they might be.

Also I have been told by some local ornithologist that Mr. Wright was the only one who could find them

he knew of this species in life. His first letter was so unsatisfactory a reply to the questions I asked, which I did on one of the State Ornithologists, that I laid him on in my second and said on him in my third — which he did not answer.

Mr. E. Seymour Woodruff, who is a capital field ornithologist, careful, and with the best ears and eyes I know, when summer home in Litchfield, told me he considered the Rev. Chalmers an Audubon enthusiast, liable to be carried away by his zeal. He kindly visited Mr. Huffy for me, got a careful description of the birds seen, and compared it with my claims of Evening Grosbeaks, and was convinced it did not apply.

Please return these letters at your convenience.

Very sincerely yours
Louis B. Bishop

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

New Haven, Conn., July 10, 1912.

Dear Mr. Brewster—

I have just heard from Dr. Allen, who says he will gladly sign Wagner's paper, and I am sending him it tonight. He writes that he thinks he has already sent Wagner in nomination, Dr. Elliot & Dr. Lucas being the other signers, Dr. Hengst and Mr. Chapman having declined to sign.

With this backing Wagner ought to have an excellent chance of election, and he certainly would be pleased to know that such men are back of him, if you think best to tell him.

I wrote him only today as we could do what we could, but I feared he had small chance of election.

Sincerely yours,
Louis B. Bishop

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 Orange Street.

New Haven, Conn., Aug. 14, 1912.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

As I found I could not get to New York I wrote to Mr. Beebe soon after my last letter to you. Strange to say no reply has come, and the limit for Jeffering Fellows has expired. Probably Mr. Beebe is away.

The letter of Wagner's recent article reached me safely, and from him has come a list of all his "Cuckoo" papers, 98 letters in all. If you think it advisable for me to send it to Mr. Hershaw and ask him to let other Washington ornithologists see it I will do so. Otherwise I will keep it till the A. O. U. meeting.

Hague is certainly a keen critic in some ways. He writes me he has found already over one hundred errors in the new edition of Chapman's "Handbook"; once he proved to me that Vaughan was wrong in certain questions of morals.

As neither of them will vote for him anyway I rather think I shall mention these points at the meeting.

Heartily yours
Louis B. Bishop.

P.S.

I so much approved of Chapman's editorial in case in identification in ~~that~~ the last Bird-Lore, that I wrote to thank him for it. Probably he won't care for my approval, but I satisfied my own sense of justice.

L.B.B.

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

New Haven, Conn., Aug. 26. 1912.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

Wagner did not send me a list of the "100 errors" he had discovered in Chapman's new book, and those he did mention were, as I remember them, trivial. The trouble with Wagner is that he is always looking for errors, is very bitter against all that offend him, and is likely to be bitter against those that try to help him if they fail or slip. What I planned to do was to show the Fellows Wagner's ornithological knowledge not by disparaging Knight's and Chapman's work but by praising it. This would increase Wagner's reputation, perhaps assure the Fellows a little of Knight's and Chapman's expense, and make it difficult for them to offend him.

Personally I think Hague has about the most unlovely character I can meet, and I studied him carefully last spring. But he is a good ornithologist. On this ground I shall work as hard as I can for his election; still, I hardly feel it fair to the Fellows to do so without telling them frankly what I learned of the man. On the other hand the latter course seems hardly square to Hague, as it is an ornithologist and not a man that they ought to vote for him, and he will not be able to attend the meetings. If I have a chance to talk with you before the vote I will tell you of my impressions last spring.

Chapman would seem a very fit successor. I note in reply to my praise of his editorial he one respects his ability more than I, and I freely admit that he has a very difficult task to keep his Auk abreast

people contented and that keep the records in Bud-Lou reliable. I think it a most interesting and instructive magazine, and that it reflects great credit on him in many ways.

What I object to is that he has caused at least to be laudation suffrage & guild & the popular clamor against collecting, for which clamor I hold the heads of the Audubon Society largely if not wholly responsible.

From Mr. Bubo I have had a most appreciative letter from London, where he is studying the Pheasants for his monograph. But I feel I ought to quote some sentences, for if she took his position "Fellow" would in time become extinct! "I am extremely grateful for your offer to nominate me as a Fellow of the A.O.U. but I would really defer you not to do it. As Mr. Sharpe has told me there has been some objection upon on the part

of some member or members and I would much prefer to remain in my present position. So if anyone should nominate me I should be very so much obliged if you would communicate my wishes on the subject to whomsoever is concerned."

Of course it is now too late to do anything this year, but when I see him I will discuss the matter with him more fully.

No doubt it will interest you to know of a most interesting specimen that arrived here last week. It is a baby boy that Mr. Bishop thinks is the most wonderful way, and I have no desire to exchange him. I am happy to say Mother and baby are doing finely.

Sincerely yours

Loren B. Bishop